

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of January 19, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 8 – 12 remain in this application. Claims 1 – 7 and 13 – 26 have been canceled.

Claims 27 – 31 have been added to this application.

Claims 8 – 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kraft, IV (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,767).

Telephone Conference Summary

The Applicants greatly appreciate the time and courtesy extended by Examiner Joseph R. Pokrzywa in attending a telephone conference on March 2, 2005. A discussion during the conference was directed toward a new reference, namely Kraft, IV (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,767), cited in a 102(e) rejection of the claims of the present application, claims 8 – 12. The Applicants noted limitations of the present claims that the cited reference failed to disclose and specifically cited the paragraph of Kraft, IV in column 7, starting at line 40, which states "The different font format of string text 124 is an indication that the text is hyper-linked to "jump" to another document. When a user clicks on string text 124 with a mouse or other pointing device, the graphical user interface will shift the presently viewed hyper-text document 123 to another hyper-linked document."

Comments/Arguments

The Office Action asserts that Kraft, IV anticipates the claims of the present application, namely claims 8 – 12. Specifically, column 7, lines 1 – 63 and figures 7 – 8 of Kraft, IV are cited as anticipating independent claim 8 including the step of "inserting a link into the document". Applicants respectfully traverse the Office Action's assertion. Figure 8 of Kraft, IV shows a flowchart containing a decision block described in column 8, lines 4 – 8 as "a decision is made determining whether or not hyper-link information such as hyper-text address links (also referred to as hyper-link addresses) are contained within the

hyper-text document.” This is showing that a decision is being made as to whether or not the document contains hyper-links and does not disclose inserting a hyper-link or link into the document. Claim 8 specifically discloses inserting a link into the document. Furthermore, Figure 8 of Kraft, IV shows that a footnote of the associated hyper-link address is generated and rendered in hardcopy form when the document is printed. The teachings of Kraft, IV differ from the claimed limitations of the present application. Claim 8 has been amended to recite the steps of inserting a link into the document, automatically launching a browser in response to the link, automatically retrieving the content of the page associated with the link, automatically converting the content of the page into an image file suitable for insertion into the document and automatically inserting the converted content into the document. The Kraft, IV reference fails to teach or fairly suggest the steps as claimed in the present application.

The Office Action further cites column 7, lines 1 – 63 of Kraft, IV as anticipating the steps of independent claim 8 of the present application. The reference discloses a difference between a screen-rendered hyper-text document and the same document printed in hardcopy form as no longer having the graphical user interface visual queue or application function to “jump” to another page. That is to say that the hardcopy of the document no longer shows or is able to “jump” or switch to the hyper-linked page and the information of the link is lost. Kraft, IV teaches a method of deciding if a screen-rendered hyper-text document contains hyper-links and footnoting the hyper-link information when the screen-rendered hyper-text document is printed in hardcopy form. Kraft, IV, therefore, teaches away from the claims of the present application. The claims of the present application notably, amended claim 8 and new claim 28, recite inserting a link which automatically accesses a network page using a browser to retrieve content from the network page. Therefore, the link is not lost, rather the link is updated and continued such that the most recent content of the network page is retrieved, converted and inserted into the document for each subsequent time the document is accessed.

Independent claim 8 of the present application recites inserting a link into a document, i.e. an electronic document, wherein the link corresponds to a page in a network. A browser is launched in response to the link and retrieves content associated with the linked page and incorporates that content into the document.

The content of the linked page is converted into an image file which is suitable for insertion into the document and when the document is printed into hardcopy form the content of the linked page is printed as well, as is recited in dependent claim 27. This concept is not taught nor fairly suggested in the Kraft, IV disclosure.

Also, claim 8 recites automatically inserting the converted content into the document to retrieve periodically changing content associated with the web page for subsequent incorporation into the document, i.e. whenever the document is accessed the current or updated information of the linked page will be converted into an image file and incorporated into the document. Kraft, IV fails to teach or fairly suggest this concept.

The disclosure of Kraft, IV teaches a hyper-link that "jumps" or switches from one page to another when a hyper-text string 124 is clicked on. This differs from the claims of the present application which disclose a method wherein the content of a page is incorporated directly into a document by inserting a link into the document, automatically launching a browser in response to the link, automatically retrieving the content of the page and automatically inserting the content of the page into the document by converting the content into an image file. This is done each time the document is accessed without need for action or knowledge by the user.

For at least the reasons stated above, independent claim 8 and claims 9 – 12 and 27 which depend therefrom distinguish over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 28 has been added to this application and further describes the novelty of the invention over the prior art. Independent claim 28 and claims 29 – 31 which depend therefrom distinguish over the cited art and are therefore in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 8 – 12 and 27 – 31) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment B. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark S. Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Apr. 11th 2005
Date


Mark S. Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582